

REMARKS

Claims 1-20, 22-25 and 27-29 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claims 1, 10, 19, 23 and 29 have been amended as shown on pp. 2-6 of the Reply. Dependent claim 4 has been included in independent claim 1 and in other independent claims. As a result, no new claim scope is included.

Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

I. Rejection of Claims 1, 10 and 29 Under 35 U.S.C. §101

Claims 1, 10 and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 1, 10, and 29 have been amended in order to overcome the rejection under section 101. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

II. Rejection of Claims 1-7, 9-20, 22-25 and 27-29 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-7, 9-20, 22-25 and 27-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 5,999,933 issued to Abhay Mehta (hereinafter “Mehta”) in view of US Publication Number 2003/0172046 issued to Zachariah Scott (hereinafter “Scott”).

Claim 1, and similarly claims 10, 19, 23, and 29 have been amended to include dependent claim 4, to state, “*the industrial device data is retrieved from a data structure, the elements of the data structure are mapped to respective record columns of the database table.*” Mehta discloses data structures, such as a linked list of process control blocks, are mapped onto a logical table 210, as illustrated in Figure 2 (column 5, lines 48-50). Moreover, Mehta discloses each table has at least one column, but to join tables, each table has to contain at least one column that is identical to all tables, such as a column with PIN’s (column 6, lines 36-38). Mehta does not disclose the elements of the data structure are mapped to respective record columns of the database table. Instead, Mehta is silent as to how the linked list of process control blocks are mapped onto the logical table 210. The Office Action further explains the logical SEG table 310 contains columns, however, the SEG table 310 is not the same as the PCB table described above (see Mehta: column 7, lines 8-9) and the Office Actions appears to be combining embodiments in order to reject the claim.

Scott discloses data stored in databases is represented and accessed via Entity Beans and Entity Beans interact with databases using Java Database Connectivity (paragraph [0005]). Hence, Scott does not disclose the industrial device data is retrieved from a data structure, the elements of the data structure are mapped to respective record columns of the database table. Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

III. Rejection of Claims 8 and 27 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 8 and 27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Mehta and Scott as applied to claims above, and further in view of US Publication Number 2004/0143791 issue dot Yuichi Ito, et al. (hereinafter “Ito”).

As described above, neither Mehta nor Scott discloses the industrial device data is retrieved from a data structure, the elements of the data structure are mapped to respective record columns of the database table. Ito discloses a conversion producing binary data (paragraph [0006]). Thus, Ito does not disclose the industrial device data is retrieved from a data structure, the elements of the data structure are mapped to respective record columns of the database table. In accordance, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [ALBRP330US].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicant undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,
AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP

/Himanshu S. Amin/
Himanshu S. Amin
Reg. No. 40,894

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP
24TH Floor, National City Center
1900 E. 9TH Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone (216) 696-8730
Facsimile (216) 696-8731